



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/759,318	01/16/2004	Editt Gonen-Friedman	ORCL5643 DIV	8350
53156 7590 06/27/2008 YOUNG LAW FIRM, P.C. 4370 ALPINE RD. STE. 106 PORTOLA VALLEY, CA 94028				
EXAMINER				
ONYEZIA, CHUKS N				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3691				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/27/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

10/759,318

**Applicant(s)**

GONEN-FRIEDMAN ET AL.

**Examiner**

CHUKS ONYEZIA

**Art Unit**

3691

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 28-36 and 40-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 28-36 and 40-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicants' amendment filed on October 24, 2007 and arguments filed on March 13, 2008 have been fully considered and discussed below. It is noted that applicant has made no current amendments. Therefore, claims 28-36 and 40-47 are pending and currently considered for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 28-36, and 40-47 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cross U.S. Patent No. 6,144,726 (PTO-892 Reference A) in view of Robinson et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,915,022 (PTO-892 Reference B) .

4. As per claim 28, Cross teaches a Computer-implemented and Internet-based self-service method for a customer to dispute a pending invoice from a vendor, comprising the steps of:

Accessing, by the customer, a database record corresponding to the pending invoice to be disputed over a Web site of the vendor (Col. 11 Lns. 16-21);

Selecting, a reason code for the dispute along with an identification of a disputed amount in the pending invoice (Col. 9 Lns. 10-13, and Fig. 8);

validating a Credit Memo Request incorporating the selected reason code and the disputed amount to create a pending Credit Memo Request (Col. 11 Lns. 45-50);

causing, by the customer, the Credit Memo Request to be sent to and routed through at least one of a selected process of the vendor for the selected reason code, a selected hierarchy of persons empowered to approve Credit Memo Request incorporating the selected reason code and a primary approver for the selected reason code (Col. 10 Lns. 13-25, examiner interprets that the review/approval module is the primary approver of reason codes);

receiving a notification from the vendor upon approval or rejection of the pending Credit Memo Request, the disputed amount being automatically credited to the pending disputed invoice when the pending Credit Memo Request is approved (Col. 3 Lns. 6-13).

However, Cross does not explicitly disclose that the dispute process is conducted thru the vendor's Web site. Robinson teaches customer initiated dispute (Robinson Col.8 Lns. 31-44), via merchant's website (Robinson Col.3 Lns. 47-55). One of ordinary skill in the arts would have found it obvious to combine these teachings in this manner, for the purpose of allowing customer a direct channel of communication to the merchant (Robinson Col.3 Lns. 55-59).

5. As per claim 29, Cross and Robinson teach an above limitations of claim 28. Cross further teaches The method of Claim 28, wherein the selecting step selects a reason code from among a group of reason codes including freight charges, taxes, shipping charges, duplicate invoice, specific invoice line and at least one vendor-defined reason code (Col. 9 Lns. 10-13, and Fig. 8; figure 8 illustrates the selection of tax as a reason code from a group of predefined codes within a pull-down menu).

6. As per claim 30, Cross and Robinson teach an above limitations of claim 28. Cross further teaches when the selected reason code does not fit a reason for requesting the Credit Memo, the selecting step further includes a step of adding explanatory comments to a blank field, thereby enabling the established hierarchy of persons empowered to approve the validated Credit Memo Request and the primary approver for the

selected reason code to process the Credit Memo Request (Col. 9 Lns. 9-13 and Fig. 8).

7. As per claim 31, Cross and Robinson teach an above limitations of claim 28. Cross further teaches the validating step includes a step of submitting the Credit Memo Request if the Credit Memo Request is correct and includes the step of correcting the Credit Memo Request if any information appearing thereon is incorrect (Col. 11 Lns. 45-50).

8. As per claim 32, Cross and Robinson teach an above limitations of claim 28. Cross further teaches the validating step includes a step of displaying the Credit Memo Request for the customer and giving the customer a first option to submit the Credit Memo Request to execute the causing step and a second option to return to an earlier screen to correct any incorrect information on the Credit Memo Request (Col. 11 Lns. 45-50, and Col. 9 Lns. 13-18).

9. As per claim 33, Cross and Robinson teach an above limitations of claim 28. Cross further teaches the reason codes, process, hierarchy and primary approver are defined by the vendor upon enabling the computer-implemented method (Abstract Lns. 1-4; examiner interprets use of the billing system as enabling the method).

10. As per claim 34, Cross and Robinson teach an above limitations of claim 28. Cross further teaches a step of authenticating a customer before allowing the customer to carry out the accessing step (Col. 7 Lns. 45-55).

11. As per claim 35, Cross and Robinson teach an above limitations of claim 28. Cross further teaches a step of accessing a current status of the pending Credit Memo request in real time (Col. 10 Lns. 57-61).

12. As per claim 36, Cross and Robinson teach an above limitations of claim 28. Cross further teaches a step of marking the disputed invoice with a legend or indicia indicating that a Credit Memo Request is pending there against (Col. 11 Lns. 36-43).

13. As per claim 40, Cross teaches an Internet-based electronic self-service system for a customer to dispute a pending invoice from a vendor, the system comprising:

a database configured to store the pending invoice (Col. 11 Lns. 16-21);

a Web site, the Web site being controlled by the vendor and accessible by the customer over the internet, the Web site being configured to allow the customer to remotely access the pending invoice and to dispute the pending invoice by (Col. 11 Lns. 16-21):

selecting a reason code for the dispute and at least a disputed amount in the pending invoice (Col. 9 Lns. 10-13, and Fig. 8);

validating a Credit Memo Request incorporating the selected reason code and the disputed amount to create a pending Credit Memo Request (Col. 11 Lns. 45-50), and

causing the Credit Memo Request to be sent to be processed through a workflow engine to send and route the Credit Memo Request through at least one of a selected process for the selected reason code, a selected hierarchy of persons empowered to approve Credit Memo Request incorporating the selected reason code and a primary approver for the selected reason code (Col. 10 Lns. 13-25, examiner interprets that the review/approval module is the primary approver of reason codes).

However, Cross does not explicitly disclose that the dispute process is conducted thru the vendor's Web site. Robinson teaches customer initiated dispute (Robinson Col.8 Lns. 31-44), via merchant's website (Robinson Col.3 Lns. 47-55). One of ordinary skill in the arts would have found it obvious to combine these teachings in this manner, for the purpose of allowing customer a direct channel of communication to the merchant (Robinson Col.3 Lns. 55-59).



14. As per claim 41, Cross and Robinson teach an above limitations of claim 40. Cross further teaches workflow engine is further configured to send a notification upon approval or rejection of the pending Credit Memo Request, the disputed amount being automatically credited to the disputed invoice when the pending Credit Memo Request is approved (Col. 3 Lns. 6-13).
15. Claims 42-47 are rejected under rational similar to that used in the rejections of claims 30, 31, and 33-36 respectfully.

***Response to Arguments***

16. Applicant's arguments filed 03/13/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

17. Applicant argues that:

Cross presents no teaching of any customer carrying out a self-service method of disputing a pending invoice by creating a Credit Memo Request as called for by claim 1.

Examiner responds that:

Cross discloses a correction module to correct errors that have been noted in the dispute report (Col 11 Lns. 45-50) response to such errors may result in a change of bill status (Col 11 Lns. 26-30). Examiner interprets such a change in billing status as a credit memo request.

18. Applicant also argues that:

Art Unit: 3691

Cross presents no teaching of any customer carrying out the steps of accessing or selecting, rather these steps are carried out internally within the customer.

Examiner responds that:

The teachings of Cross disclose both these steps, it is also of the examiner's interpretation that by employing the system of cross for dispute resolution, the customer is carrying out the underlying processes performed by Cross. As an example, one can perform a task by direct performance or by employing an agent to act on their behalf.

***Conclusion***

19. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHUKS ONYEZIA whose telephone number is (571)270-1372. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Alexander Kalinowski/  
Supervisory Patent  
Examiner, Art Unit 3691

\*\*\*

C. Onyezia 06/20/2008